

10685112

Remarks

Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner's indication that the priority document has been received and placed in the file.

Claims 1, 8-10, 13, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Matsumoto et al. (6,285, 170). The Examiner asserts that Matsumoto discloses a bridge rectifier, feedback windings, a rectifier switch and a current limiting circuit in parallel with the rectifier switch.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to add clarifying language as well as the elements of now cancelled claims 2 and 4. Independent claim 13 has been amended to add clarifying language as well as the elements of now cancelled claim 14. The rejection of claim 1 along with those that depend therefrom, namely 8-10 and claim 13 along with those that depend therefrom, namely 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) is therefore moot.

Applicants take notice of the fact that the application currently names joint inventors. The Examiner has presumed that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicants hereby confirm that the subject matter of the various claims is commonly owned as evidenced by the assignment filed with this application and currently recorded that real 015351 frame 0098.

Claims 2, 14, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Gordon (5,815,386). The Examiner asserts that Matsumoto discloses the claimed device except for having the feedback inductor inductively coupled to the input inductor of the boost converter and proceeds to rely on Gordon for a teaching of providing the feedback inductor inductively coupled to the input inductor of the boost converter.

Claims 2 and 14 have been cancelled rendering the rejection thereof moot. Claims 15 and 18 depend from amended claim 13 and require, inter alia, a feedback inductor inductively coupled to an input inductor of the boost converter, the feedback inductor being connected to a

1374677_1.DOC(41149US)

control input of a rectifying element of the rectifier circuit for feeding back a switching signal to the controllable rectifying element to change the current supplied to the boost converter and the feedback inductor being connected to a current supplying output of the rectifier circuit. As the Examiner correctly states, Matsumoto lacks a teaching of having the feedback inductor inductively coupled to the input inductor of the boost converter. Although Gordon teaches a saturable core having a reset winding and a snubber winding, there is no suggestion to combine these elements with the elements of having the feedback inductor being connected to a control input of a rectifying element along with the feedback inductor being connected to a current supplying output of the rectifier circuit. For these reasons, the amended claims 15 and 18 are believed to be patentably distinct from the combination of Matsumoto and Gordon as applied in the Examiner's rejection. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Gordon. The Examiner asserts that Matsumoto and Gordon disclose the claimed invention except for the number of windings in the switching signals being controlled by ratio of the number of windings and the windings and the switching signal being controlled by polarization of the windings. The Examiner further concludes that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine these elements. Claims 16 and 17 depend from amended claim 13 and require the elements that are lacking from the combination of Matsumoto and Gordon as described above. For the same reasons stated above, claims 16 and 17 are believed to be patentably distinct from the combination and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. (a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Min (5, 202, 819). The Examiner correctly states that Matsumoto lacks a teaching of having at least two rectifying elements connected to at least one of the input lines and two controllable rectifying elements that are switched. The Examiner relies on Min for disclosure of providing at least two rectifying elements connected to a least one of the input lines and two controlled rectifying elements that are switched. Claims 11 and 12 are a part of claim sets ultimately depending from amended claim 1. As described above, claim 1 has been amended both to clarify that the feedback inductor is connected to a control input of a rectifying element

and to further specify that the feedback inductor is inductively coupled to an input inductor of the boost converter and is also connected to a current supplying output of the rectifier circuit. Since Matsumoto lacks a teaching of these elements and since these elements are neither taught nor suggested by Min, reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Gordon and further in view of Min. Claim 4 has been cancelled. With respect to claims 3 and 7, the scope of those claims has been changed by the amendment to claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct from the references of record as described above, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3 and 7 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Gordon and further in view of Min. Likewise, the scope of claims 5 and 6 has been changed by the amendment to claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct from the references of record as described above, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

The Amendments in cancelling claim 2 and 14 necessitated amendment of the claims that depended therefrom. Accordingly, claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17 and 18 have been amended to correct the dependencies.

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayments associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,



Salvatore Anastasi
Registration No. 39,090
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: 610.722.3899
Facsimile: 610.889.3696